

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	[FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/778,874		02/08/2001	Mikio Ihama	0042-0437P-SP	6673	
2292	7590	03/11/2005		EXAMINER		
BIRCH ST PO BOX 74		KOLASCH & BIR	WALKE, AMANDA C			
	-	/A 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1752		
				DATE MAILED: 03/11/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				_				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/778,874	IHAMA, MIKIO					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Amanda C Walke	1752					
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address					
THE - External after - If the control of the contro	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory care to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO y statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>28 February 2005</u> .						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL 2b)	This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-18,21 and 22</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>19 and 20</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	·						
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Esee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in a e priority documents have beel Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage					
Attachmer	nt(s)							
· ==	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	, 	Summary (PTO-413)					
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/er No(s)/Mail Date	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	(°2B				
C Datast and	Frademark Office			עט				

Art Unit: 1752

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/13/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brust et al (6,100,019) in view of Nisikawa et al (6,007,977).

Brust et al disclose a silver halide photographic material comprising high bromide {111} tabular grains having a high chloride epitaxy. The grains are preferably silver iodochlorobromide and contain silver iodide in an amount of less than 10 mole %, and silver chloride in an amount of less than 10 % as well (column 3, line 53 to column 4, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the emulsion using any amount within these ranges.

Additionally, the inventive grains comprise either 0.75 mol % or 1.2 mol % iodide. The epitxial

Art Unit: 1752

deposits may constitute only 0.1 % of the total silver, thus the chloride may be added in an amount as low as 0.1 mol %. The grains account for at least 90 %, most preferably greater than 97 % of the total grain projected area, have a thickness of less than 0.2 microns, preferably less than 0.07 microns, an ECD of less than 6 microns, and an aspect ratio of at least 5 (column 5, lines 30-57). The grains may be hexagonal (column 7, lines 34-50). The grains contain high chloride epitaxies in the corners of the grains. The examples prepare grains having 6 epitaxial deposits, one in each corner of the grain, which implies that the grains formed by the examples are hexagonal grains. The pBr during emulsion preparation is preferably adjusted to be between 3.0 and 3.8, after the temperature has been set between 20 and 60 degrees C, and from looking at the inventive examples the temperature is preferably 40 degrees C (column 6, lines 45-67). The exemplified grains also contain one or more dislocation lines at the epitaxial junctions, demonstrating that the grains may have dislocation lines at the apexes of the grains. The material comprising the emulsion is coated on a support (column 10, lines 15-18).

Although the material does not specifically refer to the COV of the ECD of the grains, since the reference teaches that the emulsion should be monodisperse, that the COV would inherently be very low and would be less than less than the 30% and 20 % claimed given that it is most preferable for greater than 97 % of the emulsion to be comprised of the preferred grains which would have an ECD within the claimed range. The reference fails to disclose specific information on the edge lengths of the hexagonal grains.

Nishikawa et al disclose a silver chloroiodobromide {111} emulsion comprising hexagonal grains containing dislocation lines in the apexes of the grains (column 4, lines 1-46). The reference teaches that it is preferable for hexagonal grains to have a ratio of the longest side

Art Unit: 1752

to the shortest side of 2 or less (column 3, lines 11-26), and further teaches that a monodisperse emulsion will have a low COV of the ECD (15 5 or less) of the grains.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the monodisperse high bromide {111} hexagonal grain emulsion of Brust et al using hexagonal grains having a ratio of the longest side to the shortest side of 2 or less given that it is taught to be preferable by Maruyama et al with reasonable expectation of achieving an emulsion having high sensitivity and graininess.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of the present claim 1 or 2 wherein the pBr of the emulsion is at 40 °C is not more than 3.5.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments and declaration filed 12/13/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that the Brust reference teaches a high chloride epitaxy having 50 mol% of more of silver. The instant claims recite the limitation that the epitaxies comprise chloride in an amount of 50 mol % or less, which falls withinthe scope of the teaching of the Brust et al reference.

Art Unit: 1752

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda C Walke whose telephone number is 571-272-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 5:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 86\$\frac{1}{2}\$-217-9197 (toll-free).

manda C Walke

Examiner

Art Unit 1752

ACW March 7, 2005